

REMARKS

Claims 20-35 and 38-41 are pending with claims 20 and 38 being independent.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states that "which logical address could be used by the first AAA server" is vague and indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

Additionally, the Examiner notes that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the element "the product of the maximum rate" in line 2 of claim 21.

Claims 20 and 21 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Each claim is not amended to overcome prior art and no new matter has been added.

Claims 20-23, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent N. 7,197,549 to Salama et al.

Independent claim 20 recites a method for updating information in an AAA server, including regularly sending an updating message by a first AAA server of the AAA server system to all the other AAA servers of the AAA server system, wherein the updating message comprises information about changes, which have taken place since a previous updating message, of a status of subsets of an address pool which are assigned to the first AAA server, estimating a number of logical addresses issuable by the first AAA server in a time period between the updating message to be sent and a next-following updating message, in the first AAA server, before the updating message is sent, determining further subsets of the address pool, assigned to the first AAA server, wherein the further subsets, are determined according to the estimation and including the determined further subsets in the updating message in order to inform the other AAA servers which logical address could be used by the first AAA server between a next time period.

Salama discloses multiple edge routers that are connected to an AAA server. The edge routers include an IP address pool storage and a local IP address manager. The Examiner seems to suggest that the edge routers are AAA servers, since it is clear that claim 20 requires multiple AAA servers. This is incorrect. An edge router is not an AAA server and there is no disclosure in Salama to suggest the edge router includes an AAA server. An AAA server includes

Authentication, Authorization and Accounting, the edge routers in Salama do not include such features. Salama clearly only discloses one AAA server.

Furthermore, even assuming Salama discloses multiple AAA servers, Salama does not disclose regularly sending an updated message between AAA servers. The messages sent in Salama are sent when the edge router assigns an IP address, which occurs at random or non-regular intervals. Therefore, Salama does not regularly send updated messages.

Additionally, Salama does not estimate a number of logical addresses issuable by a first AAA server, as recited in claim 20. This estimation allows the AAA server to determine which addresses will be required by the first AAA server between a next time period. Salama merely alters the size of the IP address pool based upon utilization. That is, Salama adjusts pools if an IP address pool utilization exceeds a high-water mark. This is distinct from the present invention that estimates future use by, for example, forming the product of the maximum rate at which the AAA server can process requests for the issue of a logical address and the time period between the updating message which is being sent and the next-following updating message. See claim 21.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 20 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 24-33 and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Salama in view of US Patent No. 6,298,383 to Gutman et al.

Claims 24-31 are allowable for substantially similar reasons to those expressed above, since Gutman does not overcome the deficiencies of Salama.

Independent claim 38 recites An AAA server system, including a pool of logical addresses, at least three AAA servers for administrating the pool of logical addresses such that each of the servers provides redundancy to each other, and a plurality of disjoint subsets of the address pool, wherein each of the disjoint subsets is assigned to exactly one AAA server, and wherein the logical addresses of each of the subsets are assigned to a terminal device only by the exactly one AAA server.

The Examiner specifically recognizes that Salama does not disclose or render obvious at least three AAA servers for administrating the pool of logical addresses such that each of the

servers provides redundancy to each other. The Examiner relies on Gutman for this element. However, the Examiner seems to suggests that while not disclosing or rendering obvious at least three AAA servers, Salama somehow discloses a plurality of disjoint subsets of the address pool, wherein *each* of the disjoint subsets is assigned to exactly one AAA server. Therefore, the Examiner is suggesting that Salama does disclose a plurality of AAA servers, such that each of plurality (i.e., more than one) of disjoint subsets is assigned to each of these plurality of AAA servers. It is clear from both Salama and the Examiner's statement that Salama does not disclose this type AAA server.

Therefore, Applicant submits that this rejection is improper and be withdrawn. For at least these reasons, Applicant further submits that claim 38 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Jeffrey J. Howell

Reg. No. 46,402

Customer No. 29177

Dated: January 3, 2008